

GROUNDUP CAFÉ SUBMISSION

by Pauatahanui Residents Association

The application is for a resource consent for: Lot 1 DP7316 at 15 Paekakariki Hill Road, Pauatahanui, a retrospective application for a resource consent to legalise additional Cafe seating capacity from 35 to 65.

TERMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

GroundUp Café (the **Café**)

Rural Trading Post (the **Trading Post**)

Pauatahanui General Store (the **Store**)

Pauatahanui Residents Association (**PRA**)

Porirua City Council (**PCC**)

1. CAR PARKING

1.1. Allocation of new car parks removes Store access and public car parks

There are 14 public car parks on the street in front of the Cafe, the Trading Post and the Store. Ten (10) of these are for 30 minutes and four (4) for 10 minutes. The 10-minute parks were introduced by PCC particularly to assist customers briefly shopping at the Store (these time limits were discussed by PCC with PRA at the time). These are all public car parks on the road and serve the Village generally including the school and other facilities nearby. None of them are dedicated to the Café or the Store.

The Café estimates it needs 10 off-street car parks in addition to the public car parks, which are regarded by PCC as available for 'overflow', to service its existing approved capacity of 35 seats.

The Café proposes in this application to increase its seating capacity to 65 and estimates that it will require a total of 20 off-street car parks for this. The Café aims to achieve the 10 extra parks by extending its car parking over the septic tank area when the sewage connection is completed to the mains system. This takes up all the open space to the rear of the Café and the Store. But the Store's lease includes 8 car parks at the back of their shop which they pay for¹. The landlord reportedly does not allow either the Store or the Café to mark out separate parking spaces but

¹ This has been confirmed with the lawyer for the Store owners

instead refers to 'common ground', which they both use. The Store needs both parking and access to the back of their premises but Mr Ellis' application does not discuss this and it is not shown on the plans.



Café customers parked behind the Store in their leased car parking area. None of the cars in the picture belong to or have anything to do with the Store. This photo is taken from the Store looking out through the potential exit/access point, which is completely blocked.



The sign restricting access to this combined parking area to Café customers only. There is no mention of access for deliveries or parking for the Store.

1.2. Café parking plan should cater for staff parking requirements

In considering the influence of this proposal on car parking in the village in its entirety, there is also the question of providing for Café staff car parking. At present it seems that three cars, belonging to the owner and staff at the Café, are regularly parked immediately outside the gates to the Wildlife Reserve, obscuring the signs to the Reserve and partially intruding on its entrance.

Staff car parking requirements, if needed in the Village, should be included in the parking area at the back of the Café and allowed for within the parking plan.



Café staff cars parked at the entrance to the wildlife reserve most of the day, partially blocking it and obscuring part of their signage.

1.3. Café parking plan should cater for trade / delivery requirements

In considering the influence of this proposal on car parking in the village in its entirety, there is also the question of providing for goods delivery parking for both the Store and the Café. At present delivery trucks for the Store cannot easily access the rear of the shop due to Café parking blocking the way. The result is double parking on the main street to deliver goods through the front door of the Store. Similarly delivery trucks for the Café double park in the rear parking lot, blocking in Café patrons and preventing access to the rear of the Store. Council should insist that the proposal sorts out the parking issues between the Café and the Store by identifying clearly the relevant parking areas and access for each.

1.4. The impacts on traffic flow both short and long term have not been allowed for

There is the general problem of traffic flow through the village, which currently readily reaches a situation where the safety of both pedestrians and other road users are compromised. This will only increase until Transmission Gully is completed in 2020 and Grays Road is no longer a major thoroughfare for traffic, including heavy trucks, between SH1 and SH2.

The Café hours are intended to be from 7:30 AM to 5 PM seven days a week. Peak hours for school and preschool traffic are from 8 to 9 AM and from 3 to 4 PM, and from 12 to 1 PM for the preschool on Fridays. Recent traffic data shows peak traffic for weekdays from 7 to 9 AM from 700 to almost 800 vehicles per hour (vph) and again from 3 to 6 PM from 500 to 850 vph². Thus there is considerable overlap with school traffic which is already congested and limiting to school buses turning and parking safely as discussed below.

In the weekends there is a more even flow of traffic between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. of approximately 550 to 750 vph, but still peaks at more than 850vph between 1 and 2 p.m. on a Saturday.

In 2006 traffic flow through the village was estimated at 6400 cars per day according to data from the Transmission Gully Motorway Project as shown on their website. In June 2013 PCC measured the average traffic flow through the village as 8092 vph for a 7-day week, rising to 8235vph for the working week Monday to Friday. This represents a 26% increase over seven years, an increase of more than 3.7% per year, and most of this was during an economic recession.

To this should be added the increased traffic flows from Transmission Gully Motorway Construction, which commences this year. The estimated traffic

² Data for June 2013, supplied by Porirua City Council

increases through the Village for three of the next five years during construction of Transmission Gully Motorway are:

“Traffic increases on Paekakariki Hill Road (incl. Pauatahanui village) (36 months):

--Typically: 110 to 225 veh/day increase (90 Heavy commercial vehicles-HCV's)

--Peak day: 180 to 325 veh/day increase (160 HCV's)”³

To summarize: while the Café is situated to capture casual diners from through traffic, its position in the heart of the Village is totally unsuitable for increased capacity because of the present and future through traffic in the village combined with its site being directly opposite the school which has no opportunity for off street parking. The Café would need an extensive increase in off-street car parking to accommodate increased patronage.

In order to satisfy the conditions of his existing consent for the Café, which requires the provision of 10 off-street car parks, Mr Ellis claimed the Council had given him permission to use car parks on land leased to the Trading Post. However Mr Jim Sutton, Manager Environmental Standards for PCC, has confirmed⁴ that:

“This is not true as the land leased by rural trading post is for the sole use of the clients and themselves. You will need to look to your own lease agreement to find what land you are entitled to use for clients parking. “

And again:

“The Council Resource Consent requires 10 car parks are to be located in shared parking area to the south of your shop. The car parks at the front of your shop are for general public use, not exclusive to your business, and were not included in the number required in the consent.”

Mr Ellis has attempted to solve his current parking problems by:

- trying to restrict the public street parking in front of the Café to patrons only which is illegal. Information accompanying the application states on P3 “We noted there was a high turnover within the cafe with most patrons only

³ Personal communication by Craig Nicholson, Principal Project Manager, Transmission Gully Motorway Project, received on 21 February 2014

⁴ Letters from Mr Sutton to Mr Ellis, dated 11th and 4th of March 2013

residing for 30 minutes.” and yet the PCC letters from Mr Sutton to Mr Ellis, referred to above, reports -

In your discussion with Charlie you stated that 30 minutes is not enough time for your customers. You said that is barely enough time for them to place an order and be served (sometimes there may be a 30 minute wait to get there meal).

The result is that according to reliable local reports Groundup Café customers can monopolise these 30” car parks for hours.

- by his staff parking elsewhere in the Village,
- prevailing on the Wildlife Reserve to provide additional parking without success,
- successfully engineering total control of parking and access to the rear of the Store, to the point the Store has neither reliable parking or access for goods delivery which have to be delivered from the main street, again exacerbating traffic problems.

The Lavender Room, the Lighthouse Cinema, the Wildlife Reserve, Inlet Motors, the Trading Post, and Duck Creek Restaurant, all successful businesses in Pauatahanui Village, have adequate off street car parking including for staff.



Photo showing the sign Mr Ellis has posted, restricting access to the area, also leased by the Store, to his patrons only.



Photo showing congested parking which is not uncommon at peak times.

1.5. Considerations to the Wildlife Reserve for water runoff have not been taken into account

The car park surface behind the Café and the Store would need to be improved to tolerate the number of extra cars entering and leaving. If it were to be tar sealed, or even heavily metalled, consideration would have to be given to the effects of storm water runoff onto the Wildlife Reserve so that it did not interfere with their adjacent buildings, facilities, and protected environment. This is not discussed in the proposal.

1.6. Analogies to Lighthouse Cinema parking is not a suitable comparison

The comparison of parking issues with Lighthouse Cinema in the proposal is not appropriate. The Lighthouse Cinema is removed from the increased activity in the centre of the Village where four businesses, a school and a pre-school compete for road space with heavy through traffic. Cinema customer traffic is spread out during the day and evenings. It has off-road car parking, as well as onsite disabled and staff parking facilities. The cinema was also developed in full consultation with the community.

When the bypass of SH 58 to the new roundabout left a redundant stretch of road into the village via the bridge, the Lighthouse Cinema paid for road sealing and

marking of this area to provide 'off-street' parking for their customers, which has worked well.

However, increasing traffic congestion in the village has led to an increase in people parking over the bridge in this area. This is restricting customer parking facilities in this area for the Lighthouse Cinema and others. The increasing limitation of parking here directly correlates with the increasing (and illegal) expansion of seating at the Café and its associated demand for extra parking capacity.

2. CONSENTS AND COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

2.1. Council should not reward the applicant by retrospective approval for existing illegal extensions

The application does not make it clear that it is for retrospective consent for illegal extensions already constructed, allowing extra seating exceeding the previously approved number of 35. The Café has operated for over 2 years⁵ with illegal extensions and seat capacity, catering for over 35 persons on the premises.

Council is showing flexibility in allowing an application for a retrospective consent, but if approved, it will be rewarding a deliberate and illegal activity which has adversely affected the Village and, in doing so is discouraging to people who spend time and money complying openly and honestly with Council processes.

2.2. The long term plans for the site by the applicant are not consistent with either Council or Community policy

According to public advertisements by Mr Ellis these plans are the first phase of a proposed extensive specialty shopping area integrating the Wildlife Reserve land with '*an enclave of galleries, fashion and gift stores, café and restaurant*'⁶ that appear designed to replace the Store and the Trading Post.

PRA has been approached by individuals in the community who are concerned at the extent of these proposals, its effect on the character of the village, on the Wildlife Reserve, the traffic and parking issues involved for the School, the Pre-School and other trading premises in the Village, and the threat to the Store and the Trading Post. The latter are both well-established and successful enterprises for delivering services to the local community, who appear not to have been consulted on these plans. The Village has been well served by a grocery store on or near this site for 150 years. The Trading Post is successfully catering to the farming and lifestyle community that is a unique feature of the area, and is very well supported.

⁵ Based on PCC GIS aerial maps dated 2010 showing extensions

⁶ The Dominion Post, 5th and 8th February 2014

Both have legal leases extending to 2021 for the Trading Post and to 2024 for the Store from the same Landlord as Mr Ellis has for the Café, and they are all on the same title.

In 2009 a series of five community forums, organised by Porirua City Council and the Pauatahanui Residents Association, were held. These led to the development of a vi plan for the Village, published by PCC as “Future Focus: a framework for the development of Pauatahanui Village”. It was designed to map the future of the village for the next 10 years and beyond, its natural environment, and historical aspects of the area. It recommended eventual rezoning of the village area/special Pauatahanui Zone to allow for limited commercial and residential development while protecting its special character ⁷.

This philosophy was subsequently reinforced by the ‘Proposed Pauatahanui Judgeford Structure Plan’, developed and published by PCC in 2012.

“The desirability of and opportunities for further development of the village were considered. Retention of village character and scale were at the forefront when considering options for future development of the area. Key features included: Maintaining a small service commercial centre with limited redevelopment potential to ensure village character is maintained.”⁸

Mr Ellis’s plans have been developed outside these guidelines and in total isolation from the local community and from the other lessees of the site.

While the Trading Post and the Store have legal leases with the Landlord (Mr Albert Ng) for another 7 and 10 years respectively, Mr Ellis has threatened both parties with eviction well before this time, presumably for his plans to proceed. Mr Ellis has the cooperation of the Landlord, Mr Albert Ng, who has already tried to evict the Storeowners⁹ and is currently applying for a High Court order to evict them. This presumably is to allow space for the Café to expand. If successful this will also mean the loss of the Store with its 12-hour day, seven days a week service to the local community.

A previous approach by Mr Ellis’ agent to Pauatahanui Residents Association to present his proposals at its 2013 AGM did not proceed as the PRA received a legal letter from one of the affected businesses requesting PRA not to publicise the issue because of the potential for adverse effects on their business. PRA agreed to this

⁷ Page 12, “Future Focus: a framework for the development of Pauatahanui Village”

⁸ Page 9, “Future Focus: a framework for the development of Pauatahanui Village.”

⁹ 16 December 2013 with 2 days notice

request, as it appeared the affected businesses in the area had not been consulted on the proposal.

Approval of the present consent application could start a very slippery slope towards drastically altering the nature of Pauatahanui Village based on one individual's commercially driven view rather than with the support of any community consensus. The Store and the Trading Post, both of which offer a seven-day service and are highly valued by the community, are threatened by this proposal.

2.3. Effects of increasing use of the Café on the Wildlife Reserve have not been considered

Forest and Bird own the area of the Wildlife Reserve behind the land leased by the Café, the Trading Post and the Store, and the immediate area adjacent to the boundary has a QE2 Covenant that permanently prevents alternative uses. Mr Ellis has however attempted to obtain an access way into the Forest and Bird property, which would enable his patrons to use the Forest and Bird car parks for his business. He has also talked about a donation to Forest and Bird of \$30,000. These have not been considered by Forest and Bird as they are seen as enticements to accept developments that would have a negative impact on their property and the Reserve, and that are not compliant with the conditions of the QE2 Trust covenant.

As discussed elsewhere, the Wildlife Reserve has for years had to put up with overflow of water and sewerage resulting from expansion of the Café.

2.4. The applicant's actions demonstrate lack of consideration for affected parties

An alleyway, belonging to the Store, runs between the Café and the Store. It had an access door from the street allowing frozen goods to be moved directly from the street to the Store's cool storage. It also allowed access from the street for visitors to the living quarters when the shop was closed, an equivalent of a front door to a private residence.



The double doors to the left of the Tiptop veranda (indicated by yellow) were part of the Store. They are no longer present – this image is several years old.

The Café owner removed this door without discussion with the Store's owners some time ago, in order that more patrons could be seated on the veranda in front of the Café and Store. Such seating overflows onto the footpath. PRA understands that PCC regulations do not allow for the seating to encroach on the footpath and, although the Café has been notified by PCC to rectify this, the practice continues. The seating intruding on the footpath not only obstructs the flow of pedestrian traffic past the Café but impacts on access to the Store.

PRA is very concerned about the lack of consideration demonstrated by issues such as this, where the applicant has ignored the effects of his actions towards other parties, including other businesses and users of the village.



Public pedestrian sidewalk being used for Cafe seating



Obstructing access from the pedestrian path to the Store.

A ruling by the Disputes Tribunal dated 12 November 2013 states that the Landlord (Albert Ng) is to reinstate the secure door between the Store and the Café within 7 days. This has not happened.

The Store remains without a separate access way for deliveries or private access to the shop outside opening hours. Currently goods must be trundled through the shop, and similarly after hours visitors now have to be escorted through the shop.

The removal of the access way could also be a Health and Safety issue as it has removed a point of egress for people in case of an emergency.



The access way from the street, sealed by Mr Ellis without consent of the Store.



The now-sealed street door previously led to this alleyway, with storage facilities for deliveries at the right and at the end. The left wall with sheeting is the boundary between the Café and the Store.

2.5. The plans do not address the proposal's impact on adjacent affected parties

Of considerable interest is the fact that the application does not address any of the potential impacts on the other businesses (Trading Post and Store) that share the site. The plans attached to this application do not show the Store in any shape or form and make no reference to it despite it being immediately adjacent to the Café, sharing facilities such as car parking, and with the Café parking intruding on the Store's access to the rear. This is compared with at least the outline of the Trading Post on the maps attached to the application.

3. SEWAGE

3.1. Problems with the existing sewerage facilities must be addressed even for the current 35 seat capacity

It is probable that the existing 35 seats in the Café are not sufficiently catered for with the existing sewerage facilities. Until there is a connection to a mains sewerage system that can cope with its currently consented numbers, Council should continue to monitor the seating capacity in the Café to ensure it is not exceeded.

Problems with sewage disposal on this site have rumbled on for years. The main issue is overflow of the sewage from the system into the Wildlife Reserve and car parking area to the rear of the Store and Café. Such overflow is not only offensive but poses a threat to the Inlet as its final destination.

The Café and the Store share the same septic tank. Improvements to the septic system 2-3 years ago paid for by the Store leaseholders at the Landlord's insistence, did not alleviate the problems and the issue has been back and forwards to the Disputes Tribunal.

The Wildlife Reserve Committee first complained about the overflow in 2011 and has consistently done so since then. Observers have noted that this overflow coincides with high usage of the Café, particularly on fine weekends. The Café's irregular use of the sewage system, depending on customer numbers, causes surges that the septic system cannot cope with.



Overflow from the septic tank system onto the car parking area, which continues

4. PAUATAHANUI SCHOOL AND PAUATAHANUI PRE-SCHOOL

4.1. Application misrepresents schools' busiest times

Whilst peak traffic flow time is considered by the applicant to be 12.30 - 1pm (which is the Café's busiest trading time), two of the busiest and most dangerous times in the village by far are around 9am and 3pm when children are being dropped off and picked up from Pauatahanui School and Pauatahanui Pre-School. Add to that the number of vehicles stopping for a quick takeaway coffee from the Café, a newspaper from the dairy or fuel from the Challenge Service Station, and it is a

dangerous time for parents and their children or anyone walking through the village.

At a minimum, decisions regarding the application's traffic effects should not be based on an informal traffic study conducted by the applicant but should be carried out by a neutral third party.

4.2. Existing pressure on parking by Café has already impacted on bus safety

School buses have trouble turning into the designated turning area in front of the school as more and more vehicles choose to pull in and stop for a 'coffee' and by double parking or pulling in or out of the public parking spaces, they block the designated turning circle the buses require. The school buses frequently continue to the T-junction with Grays Road to turn, stopping and backing into Grays Road before turning right and returning to the school parking area. This manoeuvre of backing into oncoming traffic in Grays Road is a very dangerous practice, dictated entirely by parking pressure in the Village removing use of the turning circle in front of the Café and Store.

4.3. Existing patronage by Café has already impacted on pedestrian safety

There is regular obstruction on the footpath in front of the Café due to patron seating outside, further exacerbated by vehicles trying to park as close as they can to the Café or by vehicles turning into the Café parking area. Parents with school or preschool children, buggies, and toddlers all try to squeeze through a little gap outside the Café and negotiate the hazards around them just to get to the School and the Pre-School safely, across the adjacent pedestrian crossing. Tables and chairs used by Café patrons often spill onto the footpath forcing pedestrians to walk around them, frequently having to step onto the designated parking area to get past.

Parking problems in the village have increased since Mr Ellis started expanding the Café beyond its designated 35 patrons. Parents dropping their children off at the School and the Pre-School are finding increasingly less places to park due to the number of patrons using the Café. Many now choose to park in the car parking area by the Lighthouse Cinema, causing even more parking problems when they are operating. This also raises significant safety issues around the old Pauatahanui bridge as traffic flow and parking have become a major issue there too, with the bridge used for pedestrian traffic, particularly schoolchildren walking from Whitby using the underpass on SH 58.

5. ZONING RULES

5.1. The application needs to abide by Rural Zone rules in the District Plan

The PCC District Plan (operative from 1999 but reviewed February 2013) has Pauatahanui Village in the Rural Zone rules. Mr Ellis' application states that it is for "Construction in a rural zone" (#4) so obviously that is what the applicant expected it to be measured against. Communication with the Council officer writing the PCC planning report suggests a very narrow view on the application along the lines that it has been a commercial site since the 1800s and therefore should be able to extend and intensify with no additional requirements to mitigate any adverse effects PRA is concerned that if this approach is taken by PCC then the application is not being assessed in relation to the rural zone rules for the District Plan, or the Landscape Plan, or the Pauatahanui Judgeford Structure Plan of 2012, or the Framework for the Development of Pauatahanui Village of 2009, or the outcomes of the community consultation on the future of the village of 2012 - 2013.

We note that The Rural Zone of Porirua City Councils District Plan states -

"D4.2.2 Discretionary activity standards: There are no discretionary activity standards in the Rural Zone."

This application is being applied for under this category which appears to have no standards applied. Does this mean there are none, or does it mean that PCC can make different activity standards that ignore previous agreements between the Community and PCC in its various strategy statements for the area?

PRA requests that Council is 'even-handed' in their processing of applications e.g. we have examples of parking requirements placed on other businesses in the village (Lighthouse Cinema and The Trading Post for example). An emphasis on consistency is extremely important to PRA and the community so that those applying for consents know exactly what requirements they are expected to meet within the consent – "moving the boundaries" (literally or figuratively) does not seem to enable fairness or consistency.

A new business in Pauatahanui, The Lavender Room, was required by PCC, as part of their resource consent, to comply with the following provisions for off-street car parking, which they duly did.

"Customers require 4CP(car parks) /100m² for first 150m² then 19CP/100m²

Staff require 1CP/100m²"

Given the traffic congestion already occurring in the vicinity of the Cafe at peak times, if the same standard is to apply it seems clear that Mr. Ellis should supply all

the car parking he requires as off-street parking and should not include the on-street parks in his numbers.

Mr. Ellis's 'proposed' building covers 260 m². If the same parking calculations are applied this would indicate that Mr Ellis must provide a minimum of 27 off-street car parks.

WE OPPOSE/APPROVE THE FOLLOWING IN THE APPLICATION:

1. We oppose this application for an increase from a thirty-five-person licence to a sixty-five-person licence. The current thirty-five-person licence already exceeds the availability of the parking provisions in the traffic environment of the Pauatahanui Village area. The result has been a very overt encroachment on other businesses' parking rights including on the public parks on the main street.
2. We support the plan to upgrade the premises for 35 persons, as the original building is old and not well built.

DECISIONS SOUGHT:

1. That the application to increase licensed customer numbers from thirty five to sixty five be denied.
2. That any improvements to the building to better cater for the existing 35-person limit is approved.
3. That the current parking issues between Mr Ellis and other business operators on the same site are resolved first, and that their parking rights under their leases are respected. This should include the Landlord providing clearly defined access and parking areas for each business, by fencing if necessary.
4. That any estimate and planning for off-street parking spaces required for the Café include car parks for staff members and allow access for trade deliveries to the Store and Café. Calculations of the number of off-street car parks required should be the same as that for other commercial premises in the Pauatahanui area, should not include on-street parking and should conform to PCC guidelines.
5. That any considerations to traffic flow and impact are based on analysis of volumes and high-traffic periods conducted by a neutral third party, and also allow for the effect of traffic generated by Transmission Gully Motorway construction.
6. That the Council make clear that the public parking spaces on the street are for use by any members of the public, irrespective of their patronage of the Café.
7. That Council polices the time limits on public car parking regularly, particularly during peak periods.
8. That due to sewerage and parking limits, the 35-patron limit is monitored and enforced by the Council given Mr Ellis' current behaviour of regularly exceeding this number.

9. That Council ensures that no seating in the front of the premises intrudes on the footpath.
10. That Council ensures the previous trade and private entrance belonging to the Store is kept clear before and after the Landlord replaces the door, due to safety concerns around this access being blocked.
11. That the retrospective aspect of this application is noted, to discourage other businesses and consent applicants from failing to follow prescribed Council processes.
12. That the serious deficiencies within this application are acknowledged, including superficial accounting for traffic issues and the lack of respect for, or consultation with, the two adjacent businesses on the same site.
13. That any proposed changes to the site should consider the environmental effects on the adjacent Wildlife Reserve.
14. That this application for retrospective consent is considered under current rural zone rules and policies that apply to Pauatahanui Village.

TO CONCLUDE:

1. PRA considers that this resource consent application is seriously incomplete.
2. Any Council consent to this application will reward repeated illegal activities performed without resource consent. An example is contained in pre-filled submission forms Mr Ellis is asking his Café patrons to sign supporting his submission, including- “2 x *existing parapet signage of approximately 1.5 m x 2.5 m facing South and East*”. These signs are not included in the consent application although they have been in place for some time. It appears that belatedly Mr Ellis has realised that he needs Council approval for their placement.
3. The traffic issues involved with increased customer numbers need to be considered in far more depth and accuracy to address the limits on traffic flow and parking through the village, the impact on cars moving in and out to adjacent businesses and the available parking particularly at peak times. To date PCC has been unable to ‘police’ the parking times in the village effectively and PRA does not perceive that this will change. Traffic concerns therefore need to be addressed on a proactive basis.
4. While the heavy traffic flows through the village provide the Café with a customer base virtually independent of the local community, there has been no real effort to discuss the effects on local people, living in, and using the village. The PRA has received repeated reports that the Café owner maintains an aggressive stance to adjacent

businesses, to local events, and to individuals if they in any way are perceived to impact on his business.

5. The proposal does not discuss any effects on the Trading Post or the Store and there is no indication that there has been any effective communication with either business. Both businesses are very important to the wider community of the Pauatahanui area. In particular the future existence of the Store now appears to be seriously threatened in order to provide extra parking space for Mr Ellis's needs
6. The inability of the Café owner and the landlord to either comply with previous consent restrictions, directions from the Council, or the Disputes Tribunal, on several issues, would suggest that the Café owner should be required to first comply with the consents he already has, as well as considering any harmful effects he is having on the two adjacent businesses.
7. We do not support the proposal to increase seating numbers, which has been developed in isolation and without any consideration of preserving the character of the village.
8. PRA does not oppose development in the Village, which for its size now contains a number of thriving businesses. However PRA does believe that any developments proposed, including those proposed retrospectively, should conform to the established guidelines developed by Council with the community. Lighthouse Cinema is a positive example of a large development that, after extensive public consultation, resulted in a facility that is widely used and appreciated by the wider community and PRA notes that all the Village businesses, except the Café, are well integrated with the residential community in the Village and the much larger rural community.
9. We wish to be heard at any oral hearings.

Signed.

Date. 25/02/2014

Ken McAdam

Chair, Pauatahanui Residents Association.

E-mail: pauatahanuiresidents@gmail.com